

APPLICATION NO.

10/711,787

NEIL J. COIG

41129

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

FILING DATE

10/05/2004

10/18/2006

7590

BATON ROUGE, LA 70809

2355 DRUSILLA LANE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.

10607/001 5786

EXAMINER

MAUST, TIMOTHY LEWIS

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3751

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

John Melvin

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|--|---------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | 10/711,787 | MELVIN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Timothy L. Maust | 3751 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutotry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | |
| Status | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 Oc | ctober 2004. | | |
| | action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| - | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-5</u> is/are rejected. | | | |
| <u> </u> | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 October 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) \boxtimes objected to by the Examiner. | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Attachment(s) | _ | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1 and 2, drawn to a method for transfilling gas canisters, classified in class 141, subclass 2.
- II. Claims 3-6, drawn to a mobile gas canister transfilling station, classified in class 141, subclass 231.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different process such as one that doesn't require inspecting and evacuating gas canisters.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/711,787

Art Unit: 3751

During a telephone conversation with Neil Coig on 10/6/02 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1 and 2.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 3-6 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Page 3

Drawings

The drawings filed on 10/5/04 are informal, since the letters, numbers and lines are not uniform in nature throughout Figures 3 and 4.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 1, "An" should be - - A - -; and In line 4, "grating" should be - - granting - -. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattiola et al. in view of Niedwiecki et al.

The Mattiola et al. reference discloses a system for inspecting, evacuating, vaporizing and compressing a gas such as oxygen into gas cylinders, but doesn't disclose the concept of transporting the system to the site of filling. However, the Niedwiecki et al. reference discloses another "mobile gas canister transfilling station" wherein the system is transported to the site of filling. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Mattiola et al. system by making it mobile in view of the teachings of the Niedwiecki et al. reference in order to simplify the refilling of gas cylinders or vehicles for the end user by bringing the product to the site of filling.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Del Campo, Cohen, Eichelberger, and Stavlo pertain to various gas transportation vehicles, similar to Applicant's device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy L. Maust whose telephone number is (571) 272-4891. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Thur. 6:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine R. Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3751

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Timothy L Maust Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

Tlm 10/4/06